DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 673 FL 025 474

AUTHOR Trent, Nobuko
TITLE Cross-Cultural Discourse Pragmatics: Speaking about Hearsay in English and Japanese.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 32p.; For complete volume of working papers, see FL 025 473.
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
JOURNAL CIT Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education; v3 n2 p1-31 Spr 1998
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Contrastive Linguistics; Cultural Context; Cultural Differences; Discourse Analysis; *English; *Japanese; *Language Patterns; Language Styles; *Pragmatics; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages

ABSTRACT

Every language has different systems for expressing third party information. While in some languages grammar rules stipulate how to do this, in both Japanese and English the degree of indirection or direction a speaker should use to express information obtained as hearsay is genuinely a pragmatic language issue. English speakers tend to express hearsay information in more direct forms than do Japanese speakers. Cross-cultural discourse analysis, focusing on the concept of the speaker's information territory, reveals that English and Japanese have different pragmatic rules for dealing with hearsay information. This study analyzed the issue from both cultural and linguistic perspectives, and examined implications for foreign language instruction. (Contains 26 references, 8 discourses and a list of grammatical abbreviations. Japanese utterances in the appendix are transcribed using the Hepburn romanization system.) (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 673

Cross-Cultural Discourse Pragmatics: Speaking about Hearsay in English and Japanese

NOBUKO TRENT

Every language has different systems for expressing third-party information. While in some languages grammar rules stipulate how to do this, in both Japanese and English the degree of indirection or direction a speaker should use to express information obtained as hearsay is genuinely a pragmatic language issue. One may observe that English speakers tend to express hearsay information in more direct forms than Japanese speakers. Cross-cultural discourse analysis, in relation to the concept of speaker's information territory, revealed that English and Japanese have different pragmatic rules for dealing with hearsay information. The issue was analyzed from both cultural and linguistic viewpoints. Implications for foreign language instruction are also suggested.

INTRODUCTION

For foreign language teachers, how and when to incorporate the pragmatic aspects of the target language, that is, how to use the language properly in real-world situations, is always a difficult issue. Although there are a number of ways to define *pragmatics*, in this paper, I will use Levinson's definition, which says that pragmatics is "a functional perspective of language use that attempts to explain facets of linguistic structure by reference to non-linguistic pressures and causes" (Levinson, 1983). One view concerning the scope of pragmatics proposes that a pragmatic theory is part of performance and does nothing to explicate the linguistic structure or grammar (e.g., Katz, 1977; Kempson, 1975). Another view argues that pragmatics and grammar cannot be separated since sometimes aspects of linguistic structure directly encode the features of the context; therefore, pragmatics may cover both context-dependent and context-independent grammar (e.g., Levinson, 1983).

The latter view, which I consider realistic, suggests that all aspects of foreign language use can be considered to be pragmatics. Context-dependent grammar, which is often called "discourse grammar," is not additional information to descriptive sentence-level grammar, but essential knowledge required to be a competent speaker of a language. In actuality, however, I observe that foreign language teachers focus, in novice-level classes in particular, most often on context-independent grammar. This likely happens because (1) teachers think that context-dependent grammar will be learned appropriately after the basic context-independent grammar is sufficiently understood; and (2) theories of pragmatics are not easy to teach due to teachers' lack of knowledge of the rationales of pragmatic use of their native language.

FL025474

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M Carpenter
J Madden
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The teachers' lack of focus on target language discourse grammar might often facilitate the students' misunderstanding of pragmatic meanings of utterances in a given speech situation. Students may interpret what they hear in the foreign language in the pragmatic system of their native language and may also speak in the same manner, which may not be appropriate in a given social context of the target language. Eventually, systematic occurrence of inappropriate pragmatic behavior by foreign language speakers can lead to "ethnic stereotyping" (e.g., Scollon, 1988).

The issues of communicative misunderstanding due to differences in pragmatic requirements of different languages, such as speech acts, have been investigated, while some phenomena have not yet had sufficient attention. My topic for this paper, the cultural/linguistic differences between Japanese speakers and American English speakers in handling third-party information (in short, hearsay) has never been studied as an independent issue.

In some languages, a speaker is grammatically required to clarify the source of information. For example, in the Tuyuca language, spoken in Brazil and Columbia, morphological forms of the verbal tense/person suffix function to indicate the source of information (e.g., "visual," "senses other than visual," "hearsay," "assumed," "apparent") on which the speaker's proposition is based (Barnes, 1984, discussed in Palmer, 1986). Neither English nor Japanese has a similar kind of grammatical restriction; thus, in these languages expressions of information source reflect a speaker's subjective judgment.

Before beginning this research, I had the impression, as a native Japanese speaker, that English speakers sounded somewhat decisive and very certain regarding information about other people or other people's events. For example, suppose one of my American students said to me in Japanese, "In New Orleans, during Mardi Gras, there is no place to stay unless you make a reservation two months in advance." I would naturally understand that she had been to New Orleans during Mardi Gras and was speaking from her own experience. However, this may not actually have been the case. She may have based her utterance on something she heard which she believed to be true. This happens often enough to raise a question: Do students transfer the pragmatic use of their native language (English) into their target language (Japanese)? If so, what is the difference in these two languages in talking about hearsay? Based on these thoughts, my research questions are these:

1. How differently do native English speakers and native Japanese speakers talk about information to which they do not have direct access?

2. What is the implication of that difference, if any, to foreign language teaching?

BACKGROUND

In this study, I analyzed discourse data in light of research done by Kamio (1979, 1985, 1987, 1990, 1994) and Labov and Fanshel (1977).

Kamio's Theory of Territory of Information

Kamio proposed the idea that Japanese speakers distinguish between different kinds of information which belong to different "information territories": (1) information which belongs to the speaker's territory, (2) information which belongs to the hearer's territory, (3) information which is shared by both parties' territories to different degrees, and (4) information which belongs to a third party. He proposed that speakers use syntactically and morphologically different sentence structures according to the information territory in which an utterance falls. In this argument, indirect sentence structures indicate that propositional information is not within the speaker's information territory. That is, the speaker does not have primary, socially authorized access to the information; thus, these sentences will be expressed with phrases such as *I heard, it seems, it looks like, may,* and *apparently*[1]. From the concept of "linguistic evidentiality," these expressions are generally based on indirect evidence (e.g., "reported" and "inferred") rather than the evidence of direct experience (e.g., witnessing; see Willet, 1988; Chung and Timberlake, 1985).[2]

In summary, Kamio argued that Japanese speakers determine the owner of the information about which they are speaking and choose the proper sentence form, sentence-ending form in particular, for each utterance. The basic argument of his theory was empirically confirmed by Trent (1993).

Kamio's theory is insightful in that it gives an explanation for the observable dominant usage of indirect forms in Japanese spoken discourse. Kamio applied this theory to English also and argued that in English there are only two kinds of information from the viewpoint of information territory: (1) information that belongs to the speaker's information territory, and (2) information that does not belong to the speaker's information territory. Thus, for English speakers, the theory argues, it only matters whether or not the speaker has direct access to the information. The theory denied English speaker's awareness of a "shared information" milieu between the speaker and his hearer, and thus seems overly simplistic. Yet, Kamio did expect both English and Japanese speakers to be structurally indirect when using third-party information. However, based on the observed linguistic behavior of learners of Japanese, I speculated that English speakers use direct forms to express third-party information more often than Japanese speakers do. I felt that this idea might lead to a more realistic theory about English speakers' psychological concepts of third-party information in contrast to those of Japanese speakers.

Labov and Fanshel's Theory

Labov and Fanshel's view was informative in that it proposed a similar concept of information cate-

gories for English. Labov and Fanshel (1977) analyzed "therapeutic interviews" between mental patients and their psychotherapists. In doing so, they categorized the initiation from the psychotherapist into five event categories: A-, B-, AB-, O-, and D- events:

A-event: Events to which speaker (A) has privileged access.

B-event: Events to which hearer (B) has privileged knowledge.

AB-event: Knowledge which is shared by A and B.

O-event: Events which are known to everyone present and known to be known.

D-event: Events which are known to be disputable.

As to A-events and B-events, Labov's and Kamio's views are almost identical. Labov and Fanshel acknowledged O-events and D-events as two different categories, while Kamio treated third-party information as one category. In Labov and Fanshel's view, it seems that whether the event is thought to be known or disputable makes a difference in English speakers' acceptance of what they heard.

There are some issues we can raise regarding their analysis. First, the border between O-events and D-events can be very fuzzy. On this point, the authors claimed that one's "pragmatic presupposition" decides whether a certain event is O, AB, or D. The speaker's subjective decision is assumed in this process.

This exercise of subjectivity is very interesting. In a certain culture, how much subjectivity are people allowed to exercise to determine which linguistic forms they use? The social norm for the degrees of acceptance of speaker subjectivity must be different from language to language, including English and Japanese. If American speakers handle third-party information as everybody-knows events more often than Japanese people do, we might be able to conclude that American rules of pragmatics allow more speaker subjectivity than those in Japanese.

Second, Labov and Fanshel used the concept of "knowing" (as in "events which are known to be known" to somebody). Kamio argued that "knowing" is not a linguistically useful concept (1990, p. 195). Although he did not clarify this concept in detail, I believe it has to do with the fuzzy borderline between knowledge and belief in relation to the truth. We cannot always be sure whether we know a certain thing, or if we simply believe it is so based on some credible information source. This is a philosophical question[3] which brings up an interesting issue, namely, that the actual truth value of what we talk about possibly does not matter much so far as we believe what we hear.

An informant actually replied to the question of why he used a direct form when talking about the President's affairs by stating "Well, now everyone knows President Clinton had affairs with his aides."

This logic goes as follows: "If a certain event is an open-event, I believe it is true." Therefore, it seems that O-events may tend to form our *beliefs*, and also our *belief* of a certain event may decide which linguistic forms we use, no matter what the truth actually is. In this sense, Labov and Fanshel's categorization is also insightful in analyzing English hearsay discourse, although it may not be applicable to Japanese discourse of third-person information.

DATA COLLECTION

I interviewed four native English speakers (three females and one male) and three native Japanese speakers (two males and one female) an average of sixty minutes each regarding a variety of topics. Topics were selected to elicit information which the informant obtained through hearsay. Main topics used were (1) famous figures, such as President Clinton, Hillary Clinton, Anne Richards, George Washington, Japanese Princess Masako, and Japanese Empress Michiko; (2) people whom the informant respects; (3) celebrities, such as movie stars, musicians, and authors whom the informant likes; and (4) places which the informant has never visited, but would like to visit.

The informants are all university graduate students or university employees, whose ages ranged from their 20s to 40s. I obtained fifty-four lengthy discourses in total from seven informants. All discourses were tape-recorded and transcribed.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Data Set 1: Quantitative Analysis

The occurrences of direct and indirect sentence forms from the speaker's utterances about hearsay, i.e., information which the speaker cannot access directly, were counted. Therefore, utterances about information which was obtained through direct experience as well as utterances of "epistemic judgment" such as opinions and speculations were ignored. Utterances of hearsay comprised only ten to twenty percent of each discourse. Indirect forms are sentences that include some linguistic property which indicates that the speaker gained the information from some means other than direct experience. The unit of analysis here is basically a sentence. It is often argued that a sentence is not an appropriate unit of discourse (e.g., Schiffrin, 1987); however, since this study's main focus is on the sentence forms, considering a sentence as a unit is inevitable. Japanese is structurally an SOV language in that a verb phrase (VP) comes at the end of each sentence. Primary attention was paid to the forms of each VP ending a sentence. Sometimes combined sentences were counted as one unit, and so were some phrases due to strong cohesiveness.

Table 1 is the result of the quantitative analysis of the Japanese speakers, and Table 2 is that for the English speakers. "Unclear" items were utterances which were incomplete, so that it was not possible to determine the type of sentence struc-

Table 1
Japanese Speakers' Usage of Direct/Indirect Forms in Hearsay Discourse

Speakers	**Direct sentences**	**Indirect sentences**	Unclear sentences	Total
JPN1 (F) Yoko	15 (14.3%)	85 (78.7%)	8	108 (100%)
JPN2 (M) Yoshio	8 (17.8%)	20 (44.4%)	17	45 (100%)
JPN3 (M) Takeshi	6 (6.1%)	70 (70.0%)	23	99 (100%)
Average	**12.7%**	**64.4%**		

Table 2
English Speakers' Usage of Direct/Indirect Forms in Hearsay Discourse

Speakers	**Direct sentences**	**Indirect sentences**	Unclear sentences	Total
ENG1 (F) Sally	31 (58.5%)	20 (37.7%)	2	53 (100%)
ENG2 (M) Steve	56 (58.9%)	37 (38.9%)	2	95 (100%)
ENG3 (F) Alice	58 (69.9%)	21 (25.3%)	4	83(100%)
ENG4 (F) Linda	66 (75.9%)	18 (20.7%)	3	87 (100%)
Average	**65.8%**	**30.6%**		

ture, such as a sentence consisting only of nouns. Japanese have a strong tendency to make sentences incomplete to avoid direct assertion by omitting sentence modality at the end of the sentence. Therefore an ambiguous sentence-ending will make a sentence verbless. These utterances were regarded as unclear utterances. Informants' names have been changed.

Although the amount of data was relatively small, the difference between the two languages is fairly large. Japanese informants used indirect forms in 64.4% of their hearsay sentences, while English speakers used indirect forms in 30.6% of theirs.

Data Set 2: Overview of Japanese and English Discourse

As examples of Japanese discourse and English discourse under consideration, JPN1 Yoko's and ENG1 Sally's discourses are presented in Discourse 1. Both informants talked about the same topic. Although Yoko's discourse is presented here in English, the original Japanese text can be found in the appendix.

Speaking about the same hearsay topic (Discourses 1 and 2), Sally and Yoko showed contrastive speech styles in terms of directness of expression. Even a cursory glance at these two discourses reveals that

Discourse 1
(Yoko Regarding Clinton)

(1) Yoko:	When he was in Arkansas, he was the Gov. or something, wasn't he?	Indirect
(2)	At that time, I think it was the secretary, there was a girl who was so-so pretty, and it seems that (he) said to her that he had something to tell her or like that.	Indirect
(3)	Then, somewhat, it seems that (he) called her to a hotel suite,	Indirect
(4)	then, somewhat, he might have used the place as his office or not, I forget about that point.	Indirect
(5)	Then, anyway, he propositioned her, that is the story.	Indirect
(6) Int.:	Wow, what an impudent guy. Wasn't he married then?	
(7) Yoko:	Of course, he was already married.	Direct
(8)	But I don't know whether it is true.	
(9)	Then, anyway, he propositioned her, and it is very embarrassing but, it is said that he was dropping his underwear while doing so	Indirect
(10) Int.:	Really?	
(11) Yoko:	I don't know if it is true.	
(12)	It seems that that girl came, anyway, to the place because Clinton said that he wanted to talk about her promotion or something like that.	Indirect
(13)	And the story was very different, so the girl seemed like very upset.	Indirect
(14)	But, at that time, Clinton said, according to her, that, it seems that he said, he had no intention to do what she did not like to do.	Indirect
(15)	However, it was a great shock for her, and apparently so, then she felt she was sexually harassed.	Indirect
(16)	Then, so, eventually, she sued, didn't she?	Indirect
(17)	I don't know how that lawsuit went though...	
(18) Int.:	But, didn't it happen long time ago?	Direct
(19) Yoko:	Yes, it was an old story. Yes it is.	
(20) Int.:	She brought it to court recently however.	
(21) Yoko:	Probably so since now it is controversial.	Indirect
(22) Int.:	Still, he could make President.	
(23) Yoko:	It looks like so. I don't know.	Indirect

Discourse 2
(Sally regarding Clinton)

Int.:	What's his background before becoming the Gov. of Arkansas?	
(1) Sally:	Well, he's um, he came from a lower-middle class, I guess, family/	Indirect
(2)	Mostly raised by his mother even though she was marri-/	Unclear
(3)	Well// I think/ his father/ died when he was young/ and there was a step-father in the picture/	Indirect
(4)	But I think his step-father was an alcoholic.	Indirect
(5)	I think his// I don't know, he has a complicated background.	Indirect
(6)	But he, sort of, was always ambitious and//	Direct
(7)	wanted a good and I think because his mother also, I think she encouraged him a lot.	Indirect
(8) Int.:	He's been to Oxford?	
(9) Sally:	He was a Rhodes scholar.	Direct
(10)	So, he's obviously very bright.	
.		
.		
.		
(11) Int.:	Recently there was a scandalous matter. What I heard is Pres. Clinton's former secretary was about to sue him.	
(12) Sally:	I think she still is.	Indirect
(13)	I think she's still saying she's gonna sue.	Indirect
(14) Int.:	Please tell me anything you heard about the woman and her assertion, what she claimed	
(15) Sally:	Well, I think it's hard to believe everything she said.	
(16)	Well, she claims that/ that he made a sexual advancement/	Direct
(17)	Umm, and she claims that she was penalized in her job//because she rejected him//	Direct
(18)	But the facts are not really, they don't support the accusation.	Direct
(19)	Because she did get merit increases// you know, the next two years after that particular incident.	Direct
(20)	I think it's, I think the correct term is sexual harassment/ on the job.	
(21) Int.:	Why did she start saying that now? because I think, I thought it happened long time before...	
(22) Sally:	Several, well, it happened, a few years ago. I'm not	Indirect

	exactly sure when.	
(23)	But she's just not, I mean, I don't believe everything people say.	
.		
.		
.		
(24)	I'm not saying that, he might have flirted with her, he might have made a pass at her, I have no idea	Direct
(25)	But, see there's all these other stories coming out.	
(26)	Her sister/ I think/ it's her sister actually, was saying/ that she was all excited about Bill Clinton noticing her at the time/ this happened.	Indirect
(27)	She was not acting that she has been sexually harassed.	Direct
.		
.		
.		
(28) Int:	Isn't this the first time that he's got this kind of problem?	
(29) Sally:	No, it's not the first time.	Direct
(30)	There was someone, I think there was someone else.	Indirect
(31)	I don't remember.	
(32)	I think there was someone else/ another woman.	Indirect
(33) Sally:	Oh, I know there was.	Direct
(34)	There was another woman who claims that she had an affair with him/over a period of several years.	Direct
(35)	That's true.	Direct

Japanese discourse is filled with tag questions and phrases such as *it is said, I heard, I think, it seems,* while English discourse is more directly expressed. Sally used indirect forms *I think/I guess* several times; however, it was suggested to me by American colleagues when discussing this discourse data that it may not have been Sally's intention to distance herself from the event by using *I think,* but rather she was simply taking time to remember, or perhaps she was not certain of herself. So, Sally's "I think" was probably a kind of filler and not necessarily suggestive of true indirect forms. If this interpretation is correct, Sally's discourse is understood to be fairly direct in comparison with Yoko's.

However, since the Clinton issue is an American domestic topic, it is reasonable to assume that Yoko, as a foreigner, felt a psychological distance between the topic and her-

self even though she has lived in the U.S. over five years, and this feeling of distance may have made her speech indirect. On this point, the data indicates that Japanese informants showed the same kind of indirectness toward Japanese hearsay topics. Discourse 3 is an example in which Yoko talked about the Japanese Empress. The speaker, Yoko, spoke about this Japanese domestic subject as indirectly as she spoke about President Clinton.

However, it is also possible that, due to a long absence from Japan, my Japanese informants in the U.S. may also have felt a degree of distance from Japanese topics as well. Therefore, a Japanese native speaker living in a foreign country over a certain period of time may possibly become psychologically distant from both society's issues.[4] This assumption seems to be intuitively valid. However, if we look at hearsay discourse of Japanese speakers living in Japan, we still find a similar indirect tendency as found in Yoko's Discourses 1 and 3. Discourse 4, for example, was given by Yuko, who had never left Japan (from Trent, 1997). In Discouse 4, Yuko presented an extremely low-assertive indirect mode of speech in discussing some religious cult (*Aum-Shinrikyoo*) members at large who were suspected to be responsible for the Sarin Poison Gas case in the Tokyo metropolitan subway system in 1995. The original Japanese transcriptions of Discourses 3 and 4 are in the appendix. In Discourse 4, although the speaker, Yuko, was talking about that which is generally accepted as truth, the speech is indirect and her level of assertiveness is very low. Her utterances sound very unsure in English translation, but in

Discourse 3
(Yoko Regarding Empress)

(1) Yoko:	When she got married, <u>wasn't she somewhat plump</u>?	Indirect
(2)	Now, you see, her cheeks are sunken,	Direct
(3)	This reminds me that <u>I heard</u> that she was tormented,	Indirect
(4)	When she entered the imperial family, you see, she was the first person, from ordinary citizens.	
(5)	<u>I heard</u> that she was, therefore, tormented in the relationship between herself and her imperial relatives such as mother-in law, sisters in law, and such and such.	Indirect
(6)	<u>I don't know if it is true.</u>	
(7)	(The stories) are from Josei-Seven (women's magazine) and like that.	Source

Discourse 4
(Yuko regarding Aum Cult)

(1) Yuko:	That person is, what shall I say, in short, did he make (Sarin gas)?	Indirect
(2)	Well, he made Sarin gas, and should I say he scattered it by himself?	Indirect
(3)	So, is he a scientist?	Indirect
(4)	Aren't most of them specialized in that field?	Indirect
(5)	So, probably, well, most probably, doing research?	Indirect
(6)	University research institutes do not have much funding generally.	Direct
(7)	So after all, it is said that they entered (the cult group) under the condition that they can do whatever scientific research they wanted to do.	Indirect
(8)	You know, it is said that "religion" was a quite different thing for those people.	Indirect
(9)	So, it is also said that they went into the cult group only because they had desire to study more than they could have done at graduate school.	Indirect
(10)	So should we say they are top class scientists?	Indirect

Japanese this type of low-assertive speech is acceptable, or even preferred. Trent (1997) argued that out of 931 speech units gained from Japanese discourses on third-person topics, indirect forms, such as (tag-) question forms, inferences, hearsay forms, and indirect auxiliaries, were used in 79% of the utterances from formal speech situations, and in 42% of the informal friend discourse utterances (p. 232). Although individual speech style preference should be taken into consideration, these examples in English and Japanese may respectively represent the norm of hearsay discourse style in each language.

Then what reaction can we expect from users of one language to users of the other language? To American listeners, a Japanese speaker probably sounds ambiguous, less-confident, distant, and circumlocutory, as is demanded in Japanese culture. To Japanese listeners, English speakers may sound clear-cut, decisive, confident, and credulous in expressing high commitment to the truth value of his hearsay proposition. These attributes may not be necessarily considered positive in Japanese culture. This case of contrastive analysis might suggest a high probability of cross-cultural misunderstanding due to different

expectations in the use of the two languages.

Thus a question arises: What really makes each language use direct and indirect forms so differently in handling second-hand information? Naturally, the first explanation must be "cultural preference" (item 1 below), as has been discussed previously, but there seems to be several more factors involved, such as in items 2 through 4 below:

1. Differences in cultural preference towards indirectness and directness
2. Differences in the role belief plays in talking about hearsay
3. Differences in reporting-style
4. Syntactical differences between the languages

I will examine how each factor makes a direct/indirect difference in the use of each language.

Differences in Cultural Preference Towards Indirectness and Directness

It is generally agreed that Japanese prefer indirectness over directness (e.g., Hinds, 1985; Okabe, 1983). This is part of the Japanese politeness strategy, but often this strategy goes too far for the listeners to understand the exact meaning of the speaker. Okabe (1983) described Japanese ambiguity as follows:

> The cultural assumptions of interdependence and harmony require that Japanese speakers limit themselves to implicit and even ambiguous use of words. In order to avoid leaving an assertive impression, they like to depend more frequently on qualifiers such as *maybe, perhaps, probably,* and *somewhat*. Since Japanese syntax does not require the use of subject in a sentence, the qualifier predicate is the predominant form of sentence construction. This omission of subject often leaves much room for ambiguity. The *I* is not dominant as in English . . . . Another source of ambiguity in style is found in the preference of Japanese for understatement and hesitation rather than for superlative expression. Lastly, they are likely to resort to "round-words" with associative "round-logic." [p. 34]

According to Trent (1993), Japanese women in particular used direct+particle *ne* (for shared information) forms in 35% of their utterances when speaking about their own information. Even when talking about their own affairs, Japanese speakers showed their intent to involve listeners' knowledge by using the particle *ne* or negative/tag questions of shared information.[5] In Japanese culture, *Ano hito wa hakkiri mono o iu* (lit., 'That person speaks clearly about things') is not a compliment. Rather it indicates that a speaker does not linguistically show his acknowledgement of the

hearer's knowledge or differing opinions on the proposition.

As to the English side, American colleagues suggested that there is an American tendency to prefer directness to indirectness, although there may be regional differences. It was also suggested by American informants that in American culture, discourse such as Yoko's sounds very doubtful. These comments are supported by the literature. For example, Scollon (1988) discussed the conversational style of Athabaskan people and American/Canadian people as follows:

> We all need to feel some degree of closeness to others to gain a sense of human involvement while at the same time we need to feel some degree of independence from them for our sense of individual worth. One of the many strategies of involvement is to speak more quickly. One of the many strategies of independence of deference is to speak more slowly . . . . One of the ways in which Athabaskan people show their respect for others is by cultivating a steady, measured pace in their conversation with them. On the other hand, in contemporary American and Canadian society, we place a relatively high value on interpersonal involvement. One of the ways in which we express that is through adopting an upbeat pace in our dealings with others. [p. 20]

Tannen (1984, 1987), talking about speech styles associated with social groups, also claimed that New Yorkers' speech pattern is different from that of non-New Yorkers for the same reasons. Scollon and Tannen's idea of sense of involvement, which is highly valued in American culture, may perform a role in Americans' preference of direct forms. Immediacy, closeness, and intimacy seem generally appreciated; therefore, even in speaking about hearsay, showing that the closeness of the event to oneself might be preferred.

On the other hand, it seems that Japanese speaker's use of direct forms is pragmatically limited. Kamio (1994) suggested that Japanese speakers use direct forms only when they talk about things and people closely related to them.[6] Trent (1997: 190) modified Kamio's characterization of direct information in the following categories, which I adopt in this research:

A. Information obtained through the speaker's past or current direct experience through visual, auditory, or other senses, including the speaker's inner feeling.

B. Information about people, facts, or things close to the speaker, including information about plans, actions, and behavior of the speaker or other people whom the speaker considers to be close, and information of places

with which the speaker has a geographical relation.

C. Information embodying detailed knowledge which falls within the speaker's area of expertise (professional or otherwise).

D. Information which is unchallengeable by the hearer due to its historically and socially qualified status as truth.

These characteristics, which are socially acknowledged factors, must also be applicable to English speakers. However, based on the analysis so far, an additional factor, the individual's feeling of closeness, should be incorporated as a factor in causing direct forms in case of English discourse.

Differences in the Role Belief Plays in Talking about Hearsay

After the data collection, I asked one of the English speaking informants why he used direct forms for information which he obtained indirectly and thus without direct proof of truth. He casually replied with two reasons: (1) he clarified his information source, thus indicating that the story was hearsay; (2) he believed what he said was true. According to the informant, there are two types of hearsay: one of which is easy to believe, and one which is not (cf. Labov and Fanshel's O-event and D-event). It seems as though American English speakers in general do not hesitate to describe the former type of event in direct forms. Then what is easy to believe?

For example, it is easy to believe that O.J. Simpson's ex-wife and her friend were murdered, O.J. Simpson fled, and there was a long car chase by the L.A. police. These events are easy to believe even without watching the TV broadcast of the car chase because of ensuing mass media reports and personal conversations repeatedly focused attention on the events. (In this sense, this is an O-event). But whether Simpson murdered the two people or not is less easy to believe. The latter event could be categorized as a D-event. "Open" or "disputable" events should be decided by how trustworthy the information source is, how widely the information is accepted by the public, and probably how long it has been talked over. Discourse 5 is a good example of this point.

Discourse 5
(Steve Regarding O. J. Simpson)

(1) Steve:	Actually, lets talk about things that famous people have done.	
(2)	O.J. Simpson is a famous football player.	
(3)	He's retired but he's very very famous.	Direct
(4)	Um, I think most/ almost all Americans know him, I would, I mean if I know him, and he's sports	

	then everyone knows him.	
(5)	Anyway, apparently, his ex-wife and some man were murdered last weekend.	Indirect
(6) Int.:	How?	
(7) Steve:	Stabbed.	Unclear
(8)	And, this was in the papers throughout the week apparently that OJ had just flown to Chicago and the police asked him to come back.	Source Indirect
(9)	They found some incriminating things like what appeared to be blood in his car and what appeared to be drops of blood on, ah, his driveway,	Direct
(10)	And I just heard from my Mom this morning that last night lots of very interesting things happened	Source
(11)	First off, it appeared that he's a murderer.	Indirect
(12)	There is lots of, lots of evidence that points to him being guilty of that.	Direct
(13)	So because he's famous and a lot of people respect him, he is being treated a little differently than the average criminal.	Direct
(14)	Anyway, he wrote a letter yesterday basically sounding like a suicide note which she tried, he tried to claim that he tried to do the best things, ah, that he was, I don't know, I forget exactly what.	Indirect
(15)	Basically, it sounded like a suicide letter.	Direct
(16)	And in which he tried to claim he was trying to do the best thing at all the times.	Direct
(17)	Then he and a friend disappeared.	Direct
(18)	So then a little bit later for some reason, they found, the police found him and his friend driving on the freeway of L.A.	Direct
(19)	And then, for several hours this was all broadcast on national television where there were news helicopters and news vans following him along the freeway,	Direct
(20)	And, so was like half of L.A. was driving around L.A. trying to get a glimpse of him, stopping on the freeway waiting for him to come by.	Direct
(21)	So for several hours he was driving all around L.A. being really famous with the police and the news and everyone following him,	Direct
(22)	But, apparently he had a gun and was going to do a suicide at anytime.	
(23)	And he like had a cellular phone and people were negotiating with him and trying to convince him to...	Direct
(24)	So, finally he was able to drive over to his mansion	

	in Brentwood which is pretty close to UCLA where I went for that exam,	Direct
(25)	And then, for another several hours in the parking lot they had more negotiations,	Direct
(26)	And finally the police were able to talk with him out of the car without committing suicide.	Direct
(27)	He's probably, it looks like he's in jail now	Indirect
(28) Int.:	Did he kill?	
(29) Steve:	It's what it looks like.	Indirect
(30) Int.:	It was his ex-wife?	
(31) Steve:	His ex-wife, yeah,	Direct
(32)	Well, OK, he's apparently married to her for seven years, (indirect) had several marriages.	Indirect
(33)	He's been accused of being an abusive husband,	Direct
(34)	and he's been accused of being getting violent at times	Direct
(35)	and I guess I have to wait and read tomorrow's paper to see what happens on this.	

In this discourse, although the speaker conducted the conversation mostly in direct forms, he employed indirect forms occasionally for utterances about which his memory was not clear, as in (14), (27), and (32), and about which he was more sensitive than others to the possible degree of truth. Those are (11), which implied that OJ is a murderer, and (22), which indicated OJ was trying to kill himself. According to the informant's retrospective thought, points other than these were very easy for him to believe. Therefore, another factor of directly describable hearsay in English would be its credibility.

In summary, the characteristics of information which can be described in direct form in English are the following:

1. Factors A to D for the Japanese language mentioned previously.
2. Information about which people feel closeness, or feel a need to express closeness.
3. Information which people can believe without difficulty due to a reliable source, wide acceptance in society, good fit with existing belief structure, etc.

Differences in Reporting Styles

In Discourse 5, the speaker clarified his information source a few times (lines 8 and 10), indicating that he is talking about hearsay, and described the details in direct forms. This reporting style is often employed by English-speaking informants. Japanese informants did not clearly clarify their news source often.

Discourse 6 is also an example of English discourse. In this fairly short discourse, Alice clarified her news source three times (lines 5, 6, and 11) and described the details in direct form. The speaker reported what she heard about the incident (and had actually watched part of the event with her own eyes on TV), but as a matter of fact, she has already pretty much internalized what she heard and expressed the story with her view. In line (8), she told the interviewer her opinion but this utterance also explains that what she heard was hearsay. In a sense, she paraphrased hearsay into the form of an opinion. In her discourse, the speaker showed that she heard the events, analyzed it from her viewpoint, and formed her own opinion about the events. A similar case is seen in Discourse 2 with Sally from lines (15) to (19).

I would like to call this process the "third-party information internalizing process." This is an interesting way of handling hearsay. This reporting strategy is often found with American informants. Japanese speakers, on the other had, seem to separate hearsay and their own opinions. I feel that extensive emphasis on knowledge in Japanese traditional education, as opposed to American literacy education where the emphasis is on promoting children's critical and reflective thinking, might be responsible for this difference. In the American environment of critical thinking, children learn to internalize what they read and see through the help of social interaction, and create their own view of the world. This may be related to American speakers' tendency to treat third-person information as a basis of their own opinion. This point is hard to prove, but may be the foundation of an interesting discussion.

Syntactical Differences

Another difference in hearsay expression between the two languages may be purely a linguistic issue. English is an SVO language; therefore, in English discourse, it is possible for the speaker to say "I heard that" at the beginning of a paragraph and to suppose that the rest of the paragraph is included in the initial *I heard*, even though the following sentences are spoken in direct form. I found a number of examples of this reporting style, including that in Discourse 7.

Discourse 6
(Alice regarding O.J. Simpson)

(1) Int.:	Can I ask you about this incident?	
(2) Alice:	I know that his wife and another guy were found murdered/	Direct
(3)	that there are a lot of unanswered questions/ like where he was and why was his hand cut and/ where's the murder weapon/	Direct

(4)	They eventually figured it out.	Direct
(5)	It's said on the radio this morning that there was a fifteen inch knife, and they are looking at airport lockers in chicago/	Source Direct
(6)	There was a horrendous long car chase Friday/ some of which I watched on the TV,	Direct Source
(7)	But I didn't watch that much because a) it was boring, and b) I thought it wasn't that newsworthy. I also think that if he hadn't been a famous athlete, he probably would have been dead.	
(8)	If you are an average guy, got into the car, held a gun to his head, and chased down the highway like that, they wouldn't be clearing traffic out of the way.	Paraphrase
(9)	They tried to bring him down.	Direct
(10)	Because he was a famous athlete, he was treated differently. I don't think that's fair. I feel sorry for Mrs. Simpson.	
(11)	They were talking on the news last night, about 1989 he pleaded no contest to wife-beating/	Source Direct
(12)	and the usual sentence is like three years of counselling/ no, excuse me, three years of probation and then group counselling and/ jail time, I forget how much,	Direct
(13)	and he got counselling whenever he wanted on an individual basis.	Direct
(14)	He did not have to go to the group/ and he only got two years of probation and no jail.	Direct
(15) Int.:	That's unfair.	
(16) Alice:	Seems like it.	

Discourse 7
(Sally regarding Paris)

Sally said that she would like to go to France, Paris and local castles.

(1) Int.:	What have you heard about French people?	
(2) Sally:	Well, I've heard they don't like Americans.	Indirect
(3)	There's a real, a real move right now in France, and anti-American, or anti-Western move,	Direct
(4)	They think that, um, American food is destroying	

	their French cuisine.	Direct
(5)	And so, they are really outspoken about not liking a lot of American, umm, intrusions in their country.	Direct
(6)Int.:	I heard about language purification matter. In France, people are trying to purify their language, excluding the imported things, such as hamburgers...	
(7) Sally:	Language is a very good point. They, they really don't really like the, ah, the intrusion on their language.	Direct

In this short paragraph, the speaker used an indirect form, *I've heard*, once at the beginning of the discourse, and the rest was spoken in direct forms. It is possible to view the entire discourse as being included in the *I heard* at the beginning. That is, she did not repeat the indirect speech marker to emphasize that she was talking about hearsay. In English syntactic structure, this is practical. This strategy was also seen in Discourse 5, lines (10) to (27), and Discourse 6, lines (2) to (4) and (11) to (14).

On the other hand, this strategy does not fit in Japanese since Japanese is an SOV language in which verbs come at the end of each sentence. If we intend to use only one V to cover the entire discourse, the VP should be at the end of the discourse as shown in Diagram 1.

Diagram 1 type discourse obviously is not a natural discourse since the speaker cannot indicate that the topic is hearsay until the end of the discourse. Therefore, in order to let the hearer know that the story is a hearsay, Japanese tend to speak each sentence in indirect ways, as in Diagram 2.

In my analysis, this Japanese syntax plays a fairly large part in making Japanese discourse sound very indirect. There are clear attempts of Japanese speakers to organize discourse as in Diagram 1.

Diagram 1
Possible syntax of Japanese Speaker Talking about Hearsay

I information A ,
and information B ,
and information C ,
and information D ,
and information E **heard**.

Diagram 2
Typical syntax of Japanese speaker's talking about hearsay

I	information A	**heard,**
and	information B	**heard,**
and	information C	**heard,**
and	information D	**heard,**
and	information E	**heard.**

The strategy is to make each sentence incomplete and combine all of them as one ultra-long sentence. The following Discourse 8 is a good example. In this discourse, the subject often used *te*-form at the end of each sentence. The *te*-form of verbs and adjectives has a function of linking phrases; thus, grammatically we cannot end a sentence with a *te*-form. If we do, it creates the impression that the sentence is incomplete. In Discourse 8, the speaker ends the sentences with *te*-forms from lines (1) to (8), and it may be appropriate to consider that he connected the following sentences with "I think" in line (8). The original Japanese text can be found in the appendix.

Discourse 8
(Yoshio Regarding Michael Jackson)

(1) Yoshio:	Michael Jackson brought a 13 year-old boy in (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(2)	What did they do? That is not officially announced so I don't know well, but child molestation (noun ending).	Unclear
(3)	That boy said Michael Jackson did this and that to him in bed (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(4)	he charged the claim (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(5)	When the case was about to reach the criminal court, conciliation was made (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(6)	Then, he got the money, one or two million (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(7)	Then, nothing was filed (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(8)	But, even though there was no charge from that boy, now, the police are trying to bring the case to court being the prosecution, they are doing that sortof thing or another, I think.	Unclear
(9) Int.:	By the way, do you know something about the rela-	

	tionship between Michael Jackson and Elizabeth Taylor.	
(10) Yoshio:	Well, they are somewhat on good friendly terms	Direct
(11) Yoshio:	When the case (above) was beginning to be serious, he canceled his European tour after two or three days (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(12)	they were saying that he returned to America but actually he did not return home (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(13)	but stayed at Elizabeth Taylor's house for a while (*te*-ending)	Unclear
(14)	Then after about two weeks, he came home saying he was at Taylor's, it is said like that.	Indirect

The speaker intentionally avoids completing each sentence in order to connect each to the last hearsay marker *I think* (8), and also *It is said* in (14). In a sense, he planned his discourse ahead to exclude saying *I hear* or*I think* in each sentence. I feel this is good evidence that Japanese basic syntax influences Japanese hearsay discourse.

CONCLUSION

My ideas in this study are not difficult to teach to either American learners of Japanese or to Japanese learners of English. However, they have not received sufficient attention, mainly because teachers are not conscious of the pragmatic rules of their native language. Certainly not many of us have ever thought about the linguistic expression of speaker's concept of psychological directness and indirectness.

It seems that Kamio's theory of information territory is useful for Japanese speakers in that his theory attempted to clarify the Japanese concept of direct/indirect information with respect to the speaker. The same analysis does not adequately describe an English speaker's treatment of hearsay. There seem to be additional factors, such as the speaker's feeling of closeness to the information and the speaker's belief about the credibility of the information. These factors have an effect in the American English-language culture when one speaks of other people's information. Also the Japanese cultural preference of indirectness and the American preference of directness make a difference. This factor is purely culturally bounded. As a paralinguistic factor, the reporting style of American English speakers is also different from that of Japanese speakers. American speakers often clarify information sources and sometimes seem to internalize what they have heard into their own discourse of opinion. Differences in syntactical structure are also likely responsible for making Japanese discourse sound indirect.

Therefore, this seemingly significant difference between Japanese and American English in hearsay discourse is linguistic, paralinguistic, and cultural. Utilizing and teaching concepts such as these

should decrease cross- cultural pragmatic misunderstandings.

NOTES:

1 Indirect speech in this research is different from "indirect illocutionary acts" (Searle, 1975). According to Searle, an illocutionary act can be reduced indirectly when the syntactic form of the utterance (e.g., yes/no question form used in the sentence *Could you keep quiet?)* does not meet the illocutionary force of the utterance (e.g., directive). Indirect speech in this paper simply means structurally indirect, which is often expressed by complex sentence structure in that the matrix verb-phrase has some modality of indirectness.

2 In the theory of linguistic evidentiality, i.e., the study of how to express the speaker's commitment to the truth value of his proposition, hearsay information is often treated as only a part of the indirect evidence. There are two meanings of grammatical evidence, direct and indirect evidence, and hearsay (i.e., reported evidence) is one category of indirect evidence (e.g., Willet, 1988).

3 As a matter of fact, the study of evidentiality (or epistemology) was a philosophical topic in Greek and platonic tradition before becoming a linguistic issue of sentence modality (cf. Givon, 1982).

4 I thank Collins Scott Armstrong, University of Texas at Austin, for his valuable suggestions on this point.

5 There are abundant studies concerning *ne* and other Japanese sentence ending particles with respect to their functions and sentential meanings (e.g. Tokieda, 1951; McGloin, 1991; Maynard, 1993; Tanaka, 1977; Oishi 1985; Takubo, 1990, Kinsui, 1992). From the viewpoint of speaker's information territory, Kamio (e.g. 1994) characterized *ne* as being used by the speaker to indicate that a given information belongs to the hearer's information territory.

6 Kamio (1994) stipulated the following conditions for the information in the speaker's territory:
   (1) Information about direct experience
   (2) Information about personal data
      (2a) Personal information
      (2b) Geographical information
      (2c) Information about plans, actions, and behavior
   (3) Information about expertise

REFERENCES

Barns, J. (1984). Evidentials in the Tuyuca verbs. *International Journal of American Linguistics, 50*, 255-271.

Chung, S., & Timberlake, A. (1985). Tense, aspect and mood. In Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description: Grammatical categories and the lexi-*

con. (pp. 202-257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Givon, T. (1982). Evidentiality and epistemic space. *Studies in Language 6* (1), 23-49.

Hinds, J. (1985). Misinterpretations and common knowledge in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 9*, 7-19.

Kamio, A. (1979). On the notion of speaker's territory of information: A functional analysis of certain sentence-final forms in Japanese. In G. Bedell et al. (Eds.), *Exploration in linguistics: Papers in honor of Kazuko Inoue*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

Kamio, A. 1985. Danwa ni okeru shiten (Viewpoint in discourse). *Nihongo-gaku 4*, 4-12.

Kamio, A. (1987). *Proximal and distal information: A theory of territory of information in English and Japanese.* Doctoral dissertation. University of Tsukuba.

Kamio, A. (1990). *Joho no nawabari riron* (Theory of territory of information). Tokyo: Taishukan.

Kamio, A. (1994). The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics 21*, 67-100.

Katz, J. (1977). *Propositional structure and illocutionary force: A study of the contribution of sentence meaning to speech acts.* New York: Crowell.

Kempson, R. (1975). *Presupposition and the delimitation of semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kinsui, S. (1992). Danwa-kanri riron kara mita "daroo" (An analysis of "daroo" from discourse management theory). In *Heisei sannen-do kagaku kenkyuu hojokin sougou kenkyu (A) kenkyuu seika houkoku* (Scientific research fund general research project A report) (pp. 1-15).

Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation.* NY: Academic Press.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGloin, N. (1990). Some observation concerning *no desu* expression. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, 15* (2), 17-149.

McGloin, N. (1991). Sex difference and sentence-final particles. In Ide and McGloin (Eds)., *Aspect of Japanese women's language.* (pp. 23-42). Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Maynard, S. (1993). *Discourse modality: Subjectivity, emotion and voice in the Japanese language.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Oishi, T. (1985). *A description of Japanese final particles in context.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

Okabe, R. (1983). Cultural assumption of East and West: Japan and the U.S. In W.B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intercultural communication theory.* CA: Sage.

Palmer, F. (1986). *Mood and modality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R. (1988). Storytelling, reading, and the micropolitics of literacy. In J.E. Readenee & R.S. Baldwin (Eds.), *Dialogues in literacy research. National Reading Conference Yearbook, 1988.*

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. (1975). Indirect speech act. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol 3. Speech act*. New York: Academic Press.

Takubo, Y. (1990). Kaiwa ni okeru kikite-ryouiki no yakuwari ni tsuite (Role of hearer knowledge in conversation). In *Ninchi-kagaku no hatten (Development of cognitive science), 3*. Tokyo: Nihon Ninchi Kagaku Gakkai. 67-84.

Tanaka, A. (1977). Joshi (particles). In *Iwanami kooza nihongo (Iwanami Japanese study)*: Vol. 7. bunpoo II. Iwanami Shoten: Tokyo.

Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: analyzing talk among friends*. NJ:Norwood

Tannen, D. (1987). *That's not what I meant!* New York: Ballentine Books.

Tokieda, M. (1951). Taijin kankei o kousei suru joshi, jodooshi. (Particles and auxiliaries of interpersonal relation.) *Kokugo kokubun, 20* (9), 1-10.

Trent, N. (1993). *Territory of information and Japanese politeness strategies*. Unpublished ms.

Trent, N. (1997). *Linguistic coding of evidentiality in Japanese spoken discourse and Japanese politeness*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Willet, T. (1988). A cross-linguistic survey of evidentiality. *Studies in Language 12*, 51-97.

APPENDIX

Japanese utterances in this apprendix are transcribed using the Hepburn romanization system. The following GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS are also used.

ACC	accusative (*o*)
CONT	contrastive (*wa*)
CONF	sentential particle for confirmation (*ne*)
COMP	sentential complementizer (*no, koto, etc.*)
COND	conditional affix (*to, tara, eba, nara*)
CONJ	conjecture (*daroo*)
COP	copula (*da, desu*)
DAT	dative particle (*ni*)
DES	desiderative affix (*tai*)
DIR	directional case (*e*)
EXP	explanation
GER	gerund
INS	instrumental particle (*de*)
IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative particle (*ni, de, e*)
MODI	noun modifier (*no*)
NEG	negative morpheme
NML	nominalizer (*no*)
NOM	nominative particle (*ga*)
PART	sentential particle: VOC, RAPP, CONF, SHAR
PASS	passive affix
PAST	past tense
POSS	possessive
POT	potential affix (*re, rare*)
PROG	progressive affix (*te*)
Q	question particle (*ka*)
QUOT	quotative particle (*to*)
RAPP	sentential particle of rapport (*ne, wa*)
STAT	stative affix
TE	*te*-form of verbs and adjectives
TEMP	temporal particle (*ni, de*)
TOP	topic particle (*wa*)
VOC	vocative sentential particle (*yo, zo, ze, sa*)

Discourse 1 (Yoko-Clinton) in Japanese.

(1) Yoko: *nanka ne, aakansoo ni ita toki ni ne, ano hito gabanaa*
somewhat Arkansas LOC was time TEMP that person governor

ka nanka datta desho.
or something COP (PAST) CONFIRM

(2) *sono toki ni sekuretarii datta to omou-n-da-kedomo, maa, chotto*
that time TEMP secretary was COMP think-n-COP EXP so-so a little

bijin no ko ga ite, sono kanojo ni nanka hanashi

pretty girl MODI girl SUB exist(TE) that she DAT something business

ga aru toka itta rashii no ne.
NOM have like said looks VOC RAPP

(3) *sore o, nanka, kanojo o hoteru no suiitoruumu ni*
that TOP something she ACC hotel POSS suite LOC

yobidashita rashii no ne.
summoned looks VOC RAPP

(4) *de, nanka, soko jibun no ofisu ni shiteta ka sono*
then somewhat there self POSS office LOC made(STAT) whether that

jookyoo wa wasureta kedo ne.
situation CONT forgot EXP RAPP

(5) *Sorede sa, tonikaku kanojo ni sematta wake yo.*
then VOC anyway she DAT approached EXP VOC

(6) Int.: *zuuzuushii yatsu ne. kekkon shiteta -n -deshoo?*
impudent guy RAPP marriage STAT(PAST)-n CONFIRM

(7) Yoko: *mochiron, shita ato yo.*
of course did after VOC

(8) *demo, hontoo- ka doo-ka shinnai yo.*
but truth whether know (NEG) VOC

(9) *de, sorede, tonikaku, sematte, de, rokotsuna hanashi da kedo,*
then then anyway approach(TE) then indecent story COP EXP

kare ga jibun no shitagi no pantsu sagete sematta to-iu
he NOM self POSS underwear MODI pants drop(TE) pressed QUOT

hanashi na-n-da kedo
story-n -COP EXP

(10) Int: *eee, honto?*
wow really

(11) Yoko: *honto -ka doo-ka shiranai kedo*
truth whether know NEG but

(12) *sono kanojo wa tonikaku, sono kurinton ga kanojo no*
that she TOP anyway well Clinton NOM she MODI

puromooshon ni tsuite hanashi o shi -tai to-iu, soo-iu yoona
promotion about talk ACC do (DES) QUOT like that

furekomi de itta rashii no ne.
pass-off INS went looks VOC RAPP

(13) *hanashi ga mattaku chigatte hijooni appusetto-shita rashii no ne.*
business NOM totally different(TE) extremely upset became looks VOC RAPP

(14) *mottomo kurinton wa sono toki ni kanojo ni yoreba dá yo,*
however Clinton NOM that time TEMP her according COP VOC

sono toki ni, kimi ga shitakunai koto wa, muriyari shinai kara
that time TEMP you NOM want(NEG) thing TOP forcefully do(NEG) EXP

to iu koto wa itta rashii yo.
QUOT matter CONT said seem VOC

(15) *demo, kanojo ni shitara yappari sugoku shokku de sore o*
but from her view as expected very shock (TE) it ACC

sekuhara to kangaeta wake ne.
sexual harassment COMP thought EXP RAPP

(16) *de dakara sore o uttaeta-n-desho, kekkyoku.*
then because it ACC sued-n -CONF eventually

(17) *sono saiban ga doo natta ka wa wakannai kedo*
it law-suit NOM how turned out COMP CONT know(NEG) EXP

(18) Int.: *demo sore mukashi no hanashi na-n-desho?*
but it old MODI story-n -CONF

(19) Yoko: *mukashi no koto da yo. soo da yo.*
old MODI affair COP VOC so COP VOC

(20) Int.: *demo ima uttaeta no?*
but now sued Q

(21) Yoko: *demo ima mondai ni natteru kara soo na-n-daroo ne.*
but now problem STAT because so-n -CONJ SHAR

(22) Int.: *hee, sore nanoni, daitooryoo ni nareta-n-da.*
Gee so instead President DAT became-n-COP

(23) Yoko: *soo mitai ne. wakannai kedo.*
so looks RAPP know NEG but

Discourse 3 (Yoko-Empress) in Japanese

(1) Yoko: *kekkonshita toki nanka fukkurashiteta janai?*
got married when somewhat plump (PAST) NEG-Q

(2) *ima wa hora hoho mo koketeru shi*
now CONT you know cheek sunken(STAT)

(3) *soo ieba ibirareta -tte iu hanashi mo kiita koto ga aru*
so COND teased(PASS) QUOT story also have heard

naa.
(self-talk)

(4) *kooshitsu ni haitte, hora, ano hito*
Imperial Family DES join(TE) you know that person

hajimetedatta deshoo, minkan no hito to shite wa ne
first(PAST) NEG-Q civilian as CONT RAPP

(5) *soo-iu-no de shuutome toka kojuuto toka*
such and such because mother-in-law etc. sisters-in-law etc.

shinsekikankei toko ne, soo-iu-no de kooshitsu no
relatives etc. such and such because Imperial Family
MODI

naka de zuibun iroiro yaridama ni agerarete
inside LOC much various singled-out-for-criticism(PASS)(TE)

ibirareta -tte hanashi wa kiita koto aru kedo
teased(PASS) QUOT story CONT have heard but

(6) *hontoo ka dooka shiranai*
true whether know(NEG)

(7) *josei-sebun toko soo-iu-no ne*
"Josei Seven" etc. such NML RAPP

Discourse 4 (Yuko-Aum Cult) in Japanese

(1) Yuko: *aa, soo ano hito ga ichiban nante iu no, yoosuruni*
Well so that person NOM most what shall I say in short

tsukutta ?
made

(2) *sarin o tsukutte yoosuruni jibun de maita -tte*
Sarin ACC make(TE) in short self INS scattered QUOT

iu ka.
say I wonder

(3) *yoosuruni kagakusha ?*
in short scientist

(4) *hotondo ga daigaku no toki ni soo-iu bunya o*
most NOM univ. MODI time TEMP such field ACC

senmon to shite yatteta hito-tachi ?
major as make(TE) did(GER) people

(5) *dakara tabun tabun-tte iu ka yoosuruni kenkyuu ?*
therefore probably probably-COMO I wonder in short research

(6) *daigaku no kenkyuujo-tte shikin ga amari nai*
univ. POSS research center-QUOT fund NOM much NEG

kara
because

(7) *kekkyoku jibun ga ima yatteru-no o nandemo sukinayooni*
eventually self NOM now doing-NML ACC whatever as pleased

tsukur-asete ageru-tte iu jooken de yappari soo-iu-no
make-CAUS give-QUOT condition INS as expected such NML

ga haitta riyuu ga soo-iu-no mo aru-n-janai-ka to
NOM entered reasons NOM such NML also exist-n-NEG-COMP

wa iwareteru kedo ne
CONT say(PASS)(STAT) but RAPP

(8) *hora, sono, shuukyoo toka iu-no wa un-nun to shite,*
well well religion etc. QUOT NML CONT such and such

betsu to shite ne, soo janaika to mo iwareteiru no ne.
besides so-NEG-Q COMP also say(PASS)(STAT) VOC RAPP

(9) *dakara kenkyuu shitakute daigaku de wa daigakuin*
therefore reserch want (TE) univ. LOC CONT grad.school

toka de benkyooshiteru ijoo-ni motto benkyoo shitai-tte iu
such as INST study(STAT) more than more study want-QUOT

ishi to iu no toka mo atte itta-n-janai ka to mo
desire QUOT NML etc also exist(TE) went-n-NEG Q COMP also

iwareteiru no ne.
say(PASS)(STAT) VOC RAPP

(10) *dakara moo toppu reberu no kagakusha-tte-iu ka...*
therefore EMP top level MODI scientist -COMP-call I wonder

Discourse 8 (Yoshio-Michael Jackson) in Japanese

(1) Yoshio:*maikeru jakuson ga juusansai no otokonoko o*
Michael Jackson NOM 13 years-old boy ACC

tsurekonde (unclear)
bring in (*te*)

(2) *nani shita-n ka na? nani shitatte, nanka seishikini wa happyoo*
what did Q what did(TE) somewhat officially CONT announce

sarete-nai kedo "child molestation" (noun ending) (unclear)
PASS NEG but child molestation

(3) *sono otokonoko ga beddo de konna koto o sareta*
that boy NOM bed LOC like this matter ACC did (PASS)

toka itte,
etc. say (*te*) (unclear)

(4) *uttae o motteitte,* (unclear)
claim ACC bring (*te*)

(5) *moo sorosoro keijisaiban ni naroo-kana-tte iu chokuzen*
yet shortly criminal trial DAT become Q QUOT just before

de wakai ga seiritsu -shite (unclear)
TEMP conciliation NOM establish(*te*)

(6) *de, okane, wan milion ka tuu milion ka moratte* (unclear)
then money one million or two million or receive(*te*)

(7) *fairu wa nakatta koto ni shita kedomo* (unclear)
filing CONT happened(NEG) NML DAT made but

(8) *demo dakara sono ko kara no uttae wa nakatta kedo*
but because that boy from MODI charge CONT happened(NEG) but

ima keisatsu gawa ga nanka kenji gawa to shite
now the police side NOM somewhat prosecuters side as

sore o saiban ni motteiku toka doono-koono
that ACC trial DES bring(TE) such such and such

yattoru to omou (unclear)
do(GER) COMP think

(9) Int.: By the way, do you know something about the relationship between Michael Jackson and Elizabeth Taylor?

(10) Yoshio:*iya nanka, naka ga ii kedo* (direct)
well somewhat relationship NOM good but

(11) Yoshio:*nanka maikeru jakuson ga, sono, saibanzata ni*
somewhat Michael Jackson NOM well trial matter

nari hajimete tuaa o ichinichi futsuka yooroppa de
become start(TE) tour ACC one day two days Europe LOC

yatte, de nokori kyanserushite (unclear)
do(TE) then the rest cancel(*te*)

(12) *amerika ni kaetta-ka-na tte ittotta kedo jitsuwa*
America LOC returned Q COMP said(STAT) but as a mater of fact

kaette-nakute (unclear)
return NEG(*te*)

(13) *erizabesu teilaa no uchi ni chotto maa otte* (unclear)
Elizabeth Tayler POSS house LOC little well stay(*te*)

(14) *aa, jitsuwa koko ni otta-n-desu-yo-tte nanka*
Oh, as a matter of fact here LOC stayed-n- COP VOC COMP somewhat

ni shuukan go gurai ni hyokotto kaettekita
two weeks after about TEMP unexpectely returned

to iu hanashi.... (indirect)
QUOT story